



UNITED STORES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS

Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO. FILING DATE FIRST NAMED INVENTOR ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. GIROUARD 09/472,134 12/23/99 В PM-265136 **EXAMINER** PM92/0126 PILLSBURY MADISON AND SUTRO LLP BOEHL FR PAPER NUMBER **ART UNIT** INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY GROUP NINTH FLOOR 1100 NEW YORK AVENUE NW 3618 WASHINGTON DC 20005-3918 DATE MAILED: 01/26/01

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Advisory Action

Application No. 09/472,134

App. cant(s)

Girouard et al.

Examiner

Anne Marie Boehler

Group Art Unit

3618



TH	E PERIOD FOR RESPONSE: [check only a) or b)]
	a) X expires 4 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
	b) expires either three months from the mailing date of the final rejection, or on the mailing date of this Advisory Action, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for the response expire later than six months from the date of the final rejection.
	Any extension of time must be obtained by filing a petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a), the proposed response and the appropriate fee. The date on which the response, the petition, and the fee have been filed is the date of the response and also the date for the purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. Any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.17 will be calculated from the date of the originally set shortened statutory period for response or as set forth in b) above.
	Appellant's Brief is due two months from the date of the Notice of Appeal filed on (or within any period for response set forth above, whichever is later). See 37 CFR 1.191(d) and 37 CFR 1.192(a).
	plicant's response to the final rejection, filed on <u>Jan 12, 2001</u> has been considered with the following effect, t is NOT deemed to place the application in condition for allowance:
X	The proposed amendment(s):
	will be entered upon filing of a Notice of Appeal and an Appeal Brief.
	🛛 will not be entered because:
	X they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search. (See note below).
	they raise the issue of new matter. (See note below).
	they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal.
	they present additional claims without cancelling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.
	NOTE: <u>Recitation of a "standard position" of the standard rider is a new issue requiring further consideration and search.</u>
	ocaro
	Applicant's response has overcome the following rejection(s): The rejection of claims 59-61 based on the combination of Husted and Boyer.
	The rejection of claims 59-61 based on the combination of Husted and Boyer.
	• •
	The rejection of claims 59-61 based on the combination of Husted and Boyer. Newly proposed or amended claims would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment cancelling the non-allowable claims. The affidavit, exhibit or request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition
	Newly proposed or amended claims would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment cancelling the non-allowable claims. The affidavit, exhibit or request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: applicant improperly defines the invention based on the positioning of the rider on the vehicle rather than by claiming
	Newly proposed or amended claims would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment cancelling the non-allowable claims. The affidavit, exhibit or request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: applicant improperly defines the invention based on the positioning of the rider on the vehicle rather than by claiming the vehicle structure itself.
	Newly proposed or amended claims would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment cancelling the non-allowable claims. The affidavit, exhibit or request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: applicant improperly defines the invention based on the positioning of the rider on the vehicle rather than by claiming
□ ⊠	Newly proposed or amended claims would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment cancelling the non-allowable claims. The affidavit, exhibit or request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: applicant improperly defines the invention based on the positioning of the rider on the vehicle rather than by claiming the vehicle structure itself. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by
□ ⊠	Newly proposed or amended claims would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment cancelling the non-allowable claims. The affidavit, exhibit or request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: applicant improperly defines the invention based on the positioning of the rider on the vehicle rather than by claiming the vehicle structure itself. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection. For purposes of Appeal, the status of the claims is as follows (see attached written explanation, if any):
□ ⊠	Newly proposed or amended claims would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment cancelling the non-allowable claims. The affidavit, exhibit or request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: applicant improperly defines the invention based on the positioning of the rider on the vehicle rather than by claiming the vehicle structure itself. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection. For purposes of Appeal, the status of the claims is as follows (see attached written explanation, if any): Claims allowed:
□ ⊠	Newly proposed or amended claims would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment cancelling the non-allowable claims. The affidavit, exhibit or request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: applicant improperly defines the invention based on the positioning of the rider on the vehicle rather than by claiming the vehicle structure itself. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection. For purposes of Appeal, the status of the claims is as follows (see attached written explanation, if any):
□ ⊠	Newly proposed or amended claims would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment cancelling the non-allowable claims. The affidavit, exhibit or request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: applicant improperly defines the invention based on the positioning of the rider on the vehicle rather than by claiming the vehicle structure itself. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection. For purposes of Appeal, the status of the claims is as follows (see attached written explanation, if any): Claims allowed:
	Newly proposed or amended claims
	Newly proposed or amended claims
	Newly proposed or amended claims